

Two very enterprising gentlemen have started a new "Medical College and Post Graduate School" in Los Angeles. (One's first thought is "poor Los Angeles!") The President of the institution, according to their letterhead, is Frank P. Young, a graduate of the Kentucky School of Medicine in 1893, licensed in this state in 1909, and the Secretary is C. P. Drumm, a graduate of the Pacific College of Osteopathy 1902, licensed 1907. In a letter to an unlicensed physician in San Francisco, occurs the following interesting paragraph which explains the whole game:

"One of the objects in establishing the school is to have an institution where osteopathic physicians may enter and receive credit for the time and work they have put in at recognized osteopathic colleges. In other words, students who have had a three years' course in an osteopathic school will only be required to attend one school year at the Pacific Medical College and Post Graduate School, to receive the degree of Doctor of Medicine."

And there you are! The diploma mill working again. The law of this state would not recognize such a degree or the work done in such a school; but that information is, probably, *not* given to those who may wish to take advantage of this worthy institution. Any osteopath who accepted their proposition with the intention of applying for a license to practice medicine in this state, would simply be buncoed out of his money. Again we must say "poor Los Angeles!" for here is another one; this time it is a letter from the "Mazdaznan University, Los Angeles Section," and is signed W. H. Riley, "Food Scientist."

"We are teaching a system of dietetics that has produced marvelous results and should like to tell you more about it, as we are positive our methods are destined to supplant all systems of medication."

The sucker is a fish of the carp family; his diet is not elegant, to say the least; he is by means of being a sort of parasite, **CATCHING** also. In a few of his characteristics some of our best "nostrum" **SUCKERS.** makers and their friends are not unlike the sucker; and also like the sucker, they are easily caught. Just say something unpleasant about them and then scrutinize the "friends" that, of course with the purest of impersonal motives, rush to their defense and support! "Smith" says that ergoapiol does not advertise in newspapers and that it is intended exclusively for physicians' prescriptions. On the first count they may be true though our informant was quite sure he had seen the "ad" in some lay publication. On the second count we would only call the attention of any physician who prescribes ergoapiol in the original package to the circulars therein contained. One refers to ergoapiol itself and discussing amenorrhea says: "If the flow is absent or insufficient

in quantity because of constitutional disturbances, the preparation will afford relief by restoring vitality and functional activity to the entire reproductive system." The other circular refers in the highest terms to glycoheroin (Smith) in "coughs, bronchitis, phthisis, asthma, pneumonia and whooping-cough." Every original package sold may possibly help the layman (or woman) along the cemetery road of self-medication (or abortion). Yet the nostrum people and their "friends" say that the rules of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry are absurd. Can it be because these rules do not permit this sort of advertising to the lay public? And yet these things are intended "exclusively for physicians' prescriptions"!

Some insurance companies selling medical defense policies have written to our members telling them that medical defense by the State **TRUTH** Society is worthless, or nearly so, **OR LIES.** and that their own attorneys were the only ones that know all about the law. As against these carefully worded, malicious, lying letters, it is not unbecoming to place the following letter from a member of the Society who was recently sued for alleged malpractice and successfully defended. The "two other attorneys" were retained by this physician before he remembered that he was entitled to defense by the State Society. For obvious reasons the names are not mentioned:

"In commendation of the work done for me and for the Society by your representative, Mr. ———, in the case of Blank vs. Blank, I must assure you that Mr. ——— exhibited untiring energy and superior ability, and while I had employed two other attorneys, Mr. ——— was the general and did practically all the work in the court room."

Remember that this medical defense by the State Society is merely co-operative protection against blackmail; the members of the Society are helping to protect each other. No member knows when he himself may be the defendant in an action of this sort. Therefore, see that you keep your dues paid up; and, also, see that you help your fellow member. If he is sued and needs your expert testimony, give it and give it cheerfully; some day you may need him to do the same thing for you. Do not look upon the giving of expert testimony for the Society as something for which you should be paid. You are not doing it for a rich corporation but for yourself; you are helping to protect yourself against blackmail—for that is what 99 out of 100 malpractice suits really are; attempts at blackmail. A number of the suits we have successfully defended have been brought by people who wanted to get out of paying their physician. He sued for his bill and they sued for malpractice; we won the suits; the Society defended the member and won out. It is time the good old game of "bilking the doctor" was stopped, and that is just what the Society is doing; stopping it; making it possible for the physician to sue for